DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 268 TM 025 355

AUTHOR O'Donnell, Christopher S.
TITLE Development and Implementation of a Caseworker Performance Evaluation Instrument that Correlates to the Caseworker's Job Description in a Private Foster Care Agency.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 69p.; Master's Practicum, Nova Southeastern University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Caseworkers; Comparative Analysis; *Evaluation Methods; Foster Care; Performance Factors; *Personnel Evaluation; Private Sector; *Scoring; Social Agencies; *Test Construction

ABSTRACT

A new evaluation instrument was developed to measure the performance of caseworkers at a private foster care agency. It was designed to correlate directly with the caseworker's job description and to provide better data than the previous evaluation tool. Scoring forms were developed to compare the previously used evaluation instrument and the new one. Casework supervisors were trained in the new instrument, and results from the two instruments were compared for five caseworkers. A marked increase was noted in the standard deviation of the scores from the new instrument. This increase indicated the increased effectiveness of the new instrument in measuring actual caseworker performance. Four appendixes present the 10-week implementation plan, the evaluation instrument, the scoring form, and an evaluation comparison form. (Contains 15 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

ED 399 268

Development and Implementation of a Caseworker Performance Evaluation Instrument that Correlates to the Caseworker's Job Description in a Private Foster Care Agency.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CHRISTOPHER S. O'DONNELL
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

by

Christopher S. O'Donnell
Cohort 62

Running head: Performance Evaluation

A Practicum Report Presented to the
Master's Program in Life Span Care and Administration
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

1995

TM025355

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AUTHORSHIP STATEMENT

I hereby testify that this paper and the work it reports are entirely my own. Where it has been necessary to draw from the work of others, published or unpublished, I have acknowledged such work in accordance with accepted scholarly and editorial practice. I give testimony freely, out of respect for the scholarship of other workers in the field and in hope that my own work, presented here, will earn similar respect.

April 20, 1995 Christopher O'Donnell

ABSTRACT

The Development and Implementation of a Caseworker Performance Evaluation Instrument that Correlates to the Caseworker's Job Description. O'Donnell, Christopher S., 1995: Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University, Master's Program for Child Care Administrators. Descriptors: Performance Evaluation/Caseworker Evaluation/Job Description/Job Responsibilities/Standard Deviation/Foster Care.

Caseworkers who are employed by a private non-profit foster care agency require a performance evaluation instrument that correlates to their job responsibilities and duties. The practicum project's goal was to increase the validity and reliability of the caseworker performance evaluation instrument to effectively measure the level of each caseworker's ability to his job responsibilities.

To complete this practicum goal, the implementation phase was designed to contain four sections; the development of the new evaluation instrument, the development of the scoring forms, the training of the supervisors and the coalition of the data.

The author designed and implemented a new caseworker evaluation instrument that directly correlated to the caseworker's job description. Scoring forms were devised to compare the previously used evaluation instrument and the newly developed evaluation instrument. Casework supervisors were trained on the correct utilization.

Statistically, a marked increase was noted in the standard deviation of the scores related to the new evaluation instrument. This increase indicated the ability of the new instrument to be more effective in measuring the level of each caseworker's performance.

The new evaluation instrument will be submitted to the agency's Chief Executive Director for review and adoption of this instrument into agency policy.

Permission Statement:

As a student in the Master's Program in Life Span Care and Administration, I do give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Chapter — Page

I. Introduction and Background....5
The setting in which the problem occurs....5
The student's role in the setting....8
II. The Problem....10
Problem statement....10
Documentation of the problem....12
Analysis of the problem....14
III. Goals and Objectives....20
IV. Solution Strategy....22
Review of existing programs, models, and approaches....22
Description of solution strategy....23
V. Strategy Employed....29
Action taken....29
Results....34
VI. Conclusion....37
Conclusions and Implications....37
Recommendations....39
Dissemination....40
References....41
Appendices
A Proposed Ten Week Implementation....43
B Caseworker Performance Evaluation Instrument....49
C Evaluation Scoring Form....62
D Evaluation Comparison Form....64

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND

The Setting:

The setting for this practicum is a private, not-for-profit, specialized foster care agency. Foster care refers to the act of a non-birth family caring and providing for a child who temporarily cannot reside with his or her birth parent(s). This agency is responsible for the recruitment, approval and training of foster families for the placement of these foster children and to monitor the children's progress closely. Foster parents are people recruited from the community to incorporate a child as a family member within his or her home for a short period of time. The average length of stay for a foster child with this agency is approximately eight months. The foster parents are responsible for the twenty-four hour supervision, scheduling of appropriate medical and dental care, psychological appointments, and the general well-being of the child while he lives with the foster family. The agency's process of screening prospective foster parents consists of two in-depth, in-person interviews, a detailed homestudy, child abuse clearances, criminal background checks, and specific

safety standards. Once a family has met these criteria to the agency's satisfaction, the family will complete a comprehensive pre-service training program and participate in ongoing monthly training sessions.

The children placed in foster care with this agency are referred through the contractual agreements made with several State and county social welfare agencies. These state or local government operated agencies remove children from their biological family units for a wide variety of reasons that may compromise the safety of any particular child. These reasons range from abuse to neglect, from lack of housing to the death of caretakers.

The state social welfare agencies place children in the foster care setting as an alternative to leaving the them in the dysfunctional birth family setting or placement in the restrictive institutional setting. Foster family care is the mid-point between those two systems, and attempts to instill family values in a familial setting while meeting the child's basic needs.

Since its incorporation in 1982, this foster care agency has experienced a steady growth rate. The agency currently serves over five hundred children in fourteen programs and employees one hundred professional staff and support workers. The agency is devoted to providing a positive, loving environment which will stimulate and facilitate the growth

and development of the children in foster family care. These programs are tailored to meet the needs of children (newborn to age eighteen) who might otherwise be placed in more restrictive or institutional settings. The agency's programs, which are located in five states in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States, are designed to meet the needs of various county, state and Federal agencies.

The agency has been, and continues to be, sensitive to the ever-changing trends and policies in the child welfare field at both the local and national levels. In 1982, the agency's founder and President created this agency's first program in response to the ever growing need to place difficult teenagers in a foster care setting. The agency's President recognized that many state and local governments want to place these children in the less restrictive setting of community-based foster homes in lieu of institutionalizing the children who could no longer live at home. The prevailing trend in the child care community dictated the move away from institutionalization and the need for the less restrictive foster care placements. As a result, these programs were created in response to that trend of deinstitutionalization as they are designed to serve children in the family setting within the community.

The major assumption that the agency makes about its five hundred children is that a majority of these children,

who were abandoned, abused or neglected before coming into foster care, would fare better emotionally and physically if placed in the family setting of a foster home rather than in congregate care in an institution. These children are placed in the program that best serves their needs. The agency's programs are categorized by the type of child being served and are listed as follows: specialized foster care; medically needy and HIV foster care; foster care for children born addicted to crack cocaine; independent living preparation; and foster care as an alternative to secure detention for juvenile offenders. All of these programs are community-based and, with the exception of the independent living program, use the foster family setting for placements.

Writer's Role:

The writer is a Program Coordinator at one of the agency's fourteen offices. As Program Coordinator, this writer manages the daily operations of this office's foster care program. The responsibilities of this position are to ensure the program meets all contractual and licensing regulations and requirements; to recruit, supervise and evaluate a professional staff to meet the requirements of the agency and its contracting agencies; to recruit and train a sufficient number of foster families; to assist with the development of new programs or contracts; to participate in monthly Management meetings and yearly agency planning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

meetings; to apprise the Chief Executive Officer of the progress and needs of the program and staff; and to monitor all office expenditures, equipment needs, and repairs.

This writer has been a member of the practicum agency for over five years and has held a supervisory position for four of the five years. Positions held within the agency include Foster Home Recruiter, Caseworker, Project Supervisor, and currently Program Coordinator. These various positions have provided this writer with the opportunity to experience the agency's environment from various positions of increasing responsibilities.

CHAPTER TWO

The Problem

The Problem Statement:

According to the agency's policy on Personnel Evaluation (Policy P:6), the personnel evaluation is the basis for determining an employee's eligibility for a salary increase and continued employment with the agency. The caseworker's personnel evaluation is conducted by his or her Program Coordinator after the first six months of employment, the probationary period, and then annually at the caseworker's anniversary of employment.

On the evaluation tool currently used by this agency, the caseworker earns a certain numerical score on each of twelve different personality and job-related categories, depending upon performance. These scores are then combined for a total score. This total score determines whether the caseworker will continue to be an employee in good standing or be placed on the probation. The total score also is supposed to play an important role in determining the percentage of salary increase awarded to the caseworker. The maximum level awarded to the top performers can be as high as six percent. However, the agency has the right to lower this maximum level of increase in accordance with a lower evaluation score.

The problem lies in the assumptions that the agency's evaluation tool can accurately measure the level of each caseworker's performance in completing his or her job responsibilities and differentiate among all of the caseworkers' levels of performance. With this result, each caseworker would be awarded a maximum or minimum percentage increase in salary commensurate with his or her high or low evaluation score. However, personnel records from the past six years indicate that ninety-five percent of the caseworkers received that maximum salary increase and that the small remainder were placed on probation with no increase (R. Cruz, personal contact, 2/94). The personnel records also indicate that the evaluation scores earned by these caseworkers are closely aligned and seemed to cluster at the high end with almost no significant variation among them. This would suggest that either 95 % of the caseworkers had performed their job responsibilities at the same high level or that the evaluation tool was not capable of determining which of the caseworkers were the top, marginal, or low performers in completing their job responsibilities. The documentation shows that the problem lies with the design and format of the evaluation tool. It fails to address the job responsibilities of caseworkers and the level at which the caseworkers accomplish these responsibilities.

Documentation of the Problem:

Agency documentation to verify the existence the problem was collected from the following sources: an interview with the agency's Chief Executive Officer, an interview with the agency's Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper, minutes from the most recent three Strategic Planning Meetings, and a questionnaire completed by the caseworkers' supervisors.

An interview with the Chief Executive Officer was conducted because she is the person most qualified to discuss agency policy. She reports that she is responsible for the overall supervision of the entire agency staff. She has held this position for the past year, and she held her previous position as Associate Executive Director for eight years. In addition, she has the distinction of being the agency's co-founder. She confirmed that the current evaluation tool has been used by the agency for the past six years. This tool had satisfied the agency's needs during the first few years; but the agency's needs continued to change, and the evaluation tool has become outdated (C. Eberwein, personal communication, April 5, 1994). The agency experienced a strong growth period over the past five years as the existing programs expanded, new programs were started, and the number of caseworkers tripled. Three years ago, she began receiving negative feedback regarding the evaluation from the different program managers (Program Coordinators) and regional managers

(Regional Directors). As the agency started to employ a larger number of caseworkers, it became very important to have a reliable instrument to measure their level of performance. She believes the agency would benefit from a more tailored evaluation instrument that would be more specific in measuring the caseworkers' ability to complete their job responsibilities, and the feedback confirmed her belief (C. Eberwein, personal communication, April 5, 1994).

An interview with the agency's Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper was conducted to discuss the results of the caseworker evaluations completed over the past six years. The records indicated that ninety-five percent of the caseworkers received the maximum raise, while the remaining five percent were placed on probation and did not receive a raise. As for the ninety-five percent, the records are not clear if any of them had performed better or worse than their peers. This lack of clarity is caused by the small variation in total evaluation scores earned by these caseworkers (R. Cruz, personal contact, February 15, 1994). The Recordkeeper was not sure that the current evaluation instrument was designed to offer a true comparison among the caseworkers (R. Cruz, personal contact, February 15, 1994).

Minutes from the last three Strategic Planning meetings, from January 1992 to August 1993, expressed the continued

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

agency awareness of the problem with the current evaluation instrument. The strategic planning meetings consist of all of the agency's managers coming together for approximately three consecutive days to address current and potential problems facing the agency and to develop corrective action plans. At each of these meetings, the agenda required that the group develop plans for improving the personnel evaluation instrument. However, the minutes from these meetings indicate that the agency was unable to develop a corrective action plan for improving the evaluation instrument.

Each Program Coordinator and Regional Director who had completed an evaluation of a caseworker during the past six years was asked to complete a questionnaire. This questionnaire required the respondents to rate and comment on the current evaluation instrument. The responses indicated that the Program Coordinators and Regional Directors perceive the evaluation tool did not allow them to differentiate among caseworkers in regard to level of performance. The responses also indicated that the evaluation instrument does not address the caseworkers' ability to complete their job responsibilities as outlined by the caseworker's job description.

Analysis of the Problem.

It is this writer's opinion that there are four factors

that are contributing to this problem. First, the evaluation instrument currently being used was developed over six years ago when the agency's responsibilities for its caseworkers and the number of caseworkers employed were much lower. Second, the agency's growth led to the tripling of the casework staff and to the creation of more specific responsibilities for the casework position. This required a detailed evaluation instrument to monitor these added responsibilities. Third, in the past there was a smaller number of caseworkers and the agency was able to afford the awarding of the maximum percentage salary increase to each of them without major financial implications. Fourth, the agency was unable to dedicate the time or personnel to correct this problem because of the need to spend all of its efforts addressing the problems facing the children that the agency serves.

The current evaluation instrument which was developed over six years ago addresses or attempts to measure very few of the caseworker's actual job responsibilities. Since the time the current evaluation instrument was developed, the agency's caseworker job description has been redesigned to be a more detailed outline of the caseworker's responsibilities. However, the evaluation was not redesigned to incorporate this new, more detailed job description. The accountability for measuring the employee's completion of the tasks and

responsibilities of the position belongs to the job evaluation process (Emerson, 1991). Without this incorporation, the caseworker cannot be measured on his or her ability to complete the job responsibilities, and the caseworker cannot receive the feedback to know if he or she is performing above or below the expectations of the job. The caseworker or any employee could assume that he or she was fulfilling job responsibilities if he or she is not being evaluated on these specific responsibilities (Mohrman, West & Lawler, 1989). The caseworker can receive feedback on job performance from his or her supervisor, but it must also be documented on the caseworker's evaluation instrument. This documentation is an ongoing record of each employee's level of performance and can be an appropriate measure if the performance appraisal correlates to the job description (Cathcart, Hemminger, Hoffman, & Van Veen, 1983).

As documented in the minutes from the Strategic Planning Sessions, the agency's Program Coordinators and Regional Directors have recognized the need to improve the evaluation instrument. This issue has been discussed in the past three Strategic Planning Sessions covering a three-year span. However, the management group was unable to solve the issue, and the issue was always tabled for discussion at future meetings. The factors contributing to this lack of action are the management staff being too overloaded with their own

job responsibilities to dedicate time to the improvement of the evaluation instrument, and the agency lacked the financial resources to hire more management staff.

A review of the literature was conducted to determine the problems that other agencies and companies have experienced with the performance evaluation instrument. Much of the literature identified the importance of having the performance evaluation instrument correlate to the job description. As a major component of the evaluation instrument, employees must be evaluated on the clear and specific job requirements that they are expected to accomplish (Alexander Hamilton Institute [AHI], 1989). Brillinger (1990) states that the content of a performance evaluation is to assess the employee's ability to complete his or her tasks as defined in the job description.

Of the performance evaluations that Mohrman, West and Lawler (1989) described as failures, all lacked clear reference to the employee's responsibilities. Without analyzing the employee's ability to complete his or her job tasks, the employee and employer are not receiving the feedback that they both desire and need. The evaluation instrument must be able to differentiate between the high and low performers in order to recognize and reward the high performers and to identify problem areas with the low performers (Carson, Cardy, & Dobbins, 1992). Research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

indicates that agencies experience lower turnover rates when employees receive formal positive feedback on their performance in meeting clearly defined job responsibilities and expectations (Child Welfare League of America, 1991). Cathcart, Hemminger, Hoffman and Van Veen (1983) recommended that an employer insure that the performance evaluation instrument is related to the employee's job duties as this will not only create an accurate performance evaluation but will also protect the employer from litigation by employees who may challenge their dismissals.

There are different measurements scales that are used in performance evaluation instruments. Cascio and Ramos (1985) reported that the evaluations using behaviorally anchored scales would produce reliable measurements and clear understandings of the variations between each evaluation. The behaviorally anchored scale is the method of labeling points along a rating scale with specific behavioral descriptions that represent different levels of performance. The behaviorally anchored scale is a superior method of evaluating employee performance if it is used to identify important and relevant job responsibilities (Szilagyi, 1984).

To increase the reliability and validity among all of the performance evaluations conducted by an agency, the evaluators or raters should receive training on the use of the evaluation instrument and the rating scale. Hahn and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Diphoye (1988) found that training of the evaluators appeared to increase the accuracy and reliability of the results of their evaluations. A survey of corporate training practices of organizations with at least 100 employees ranked performance appraisal training second only to new employee orientation as the most specific types of training required (Froiland, 1993).

CHAPTER THREE

GOALS and OBJECTIVES:

The goal of this practicum project was to increase the validity and reliability of the caseworker's performance evaluation instrument, which measures each caseworker's level of performance in meeting specific job responsibilities.

Expected Outcomes:

(1) It was expected that there would be an increase of at least 50 % when the standard deviation in the scores of all evaluated caseworkers from the previous annual revue (using the previous evaluation instrument) and the current annual review (using the proposed evaluation instrument) are compared with each other, thus indicating greater ability of the new evaluation instrument to discern and record actual performance.

(2) It was expected that the correlation of the items on the proposed evaluation instrument with the items on the job description will be at least 90 %, as measured by an item by item inventory completed by the

Program Coordinators using the new instrument and by the caseworkers evaluated by it. This correlation would then be compared to the correlation of items on the previous evaluation instrument to the same job description, completed prior to each evaluation. The correlation on that instrument was expected to be less than 50 %.

Chapter Four

Solution Strategy.

Review of existing programs, models, and approaches.

A review of the literature and other resources was conducted to determine possible solutions for this practicum problem. This writer was unable to obtain any actual evaluation instruments to use as models. Instead, the literature contained professional opinions on the problems with evaluation instruments and offered solutions to correct them. The majority of literature focused on the importance of having the performance evaluation instrument correlate to the job description. The evaluation instrument can be considered an appropriate measure only if rates the employee on his or her actual job responsibilities (Cathcart, Hemminger, Hoffman & Van Veen, 1983). Mohrman, West, and Lawler (1989) conducted research on performance evaluation instruments and reported that the instruments lacking clear reference to the employee's job responsibilities were considered "poorly designed."

Burda (1992) argues that the Total Quality Management (TQM) method is best suited for the performance evaluation. This method of evaluation is not based on the point system but uses a "personal development process" in which the manager and employee work together to set performance goals

for the future (Burda, 1992).

Szilagyi (1984) reported that using a point system based on a behaviorally anchored scale is a superior method of evaluating an employee's performance in meeting his or her job responsibilities.

Description of Selected Solutions:

To achieve the goal of indicating greater ability of the new evaluation instrument to discern and record actual performance, it was imperative to evaluate four major areas: development of a new instrument, development of scoring forms, training of Program Coordinators, and finally the coalition of data.

First, a new evaluation instrument was completed. The personal communication with the Chief Executive Officer and the Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper, minutes from the Strategic Planning Meetings and a questionnaire completed by the casework supervisors, documented the need for an evaluation instrument to reflect the caseworker's job responsibilities. Mohrman, West and Lawler, (1989), summarized the collective writers' opinions by stating "The performance appraisal system needs to reflect the design of work and to measure the critical success factors for each job" (Mohrman et al., 1989, p.37).

The caseworker's job description was incorporated into the Caseworker Performance Evaluation Instrument. Each

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the twenty-seven responsibilities and duties listed on the caseworker's job description will become measurable items on the new caseworker Performance Evaluation Instrument. The caseworker will be measured on each of these twenty-seven job functions by a Program Coordinator who will assign a numerical rating as to the caseworker's level of performance.

The numerical rating will be based upon "a behaviorally based (anchored) method that would still permit reliable measurement" (Cascio & Ramos, p. 20). The following rating scale will be utilized:

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) No opportunity to perform in this area

This is the behaviorally based rating scale that is presently used as part of the evaluation instrument for foster parents at this agency. This format is already used by the employees and familiar to them as a rating scale, thereby increasing the reliability of this rating system.

Once the new evaluation instrument was drafted, this new instrument was presented to the Chief Executive Officer, to seek approval for its use during the ten-week implementation period. Any suggestions or remediations offered by the Chief Executive Officer were incorporated into the evaluation instrument. Upon the Chief Executive Officer's approval of

the new Evaluation Instrument, it was used during the implementation period for all scheduled caseworker evaluations.

The scoring forms were also devised by this writer. The first form to be constructed was the Evaluation Scoring Form. This form has three columns. The first column lists a code letter designated to each worker by the Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper in order to maintain confidentiality of the caseworkers. The second column lists each of the corresponding caseworker's evaluation scores received from his or her previous evaluation (using the old evaluation instrument). The third column lists each caseworker's evaluation score as determined by his or her current evaluation (using the new evaluation instrument). At the bottom of columns two and three, the standard deviations of the scores for the old instrument and the new instrument were computed separately. This standard deviation shows the scoring variation between each of the caseworker's scores on the old evaluation instrument and then on the new evaluation instrument. "The standard deviation is a valuable piece of information because it indicates the extent to which the sample estimates will be distributed around the population" (Babbie and Rubin, 1989, p. 205). It was expected that there would be an increase of at least 50% when the standard deviation of the scores of the new instrument was compared to

the old instrument, thus indicating the greater ability of the new evaluation instrument to discern and record actual performance.

The second form which was developed was the Evaluation Comparison Form. This form was designed in a checklist format that contained the twenty-seven caseworker job responsibilities and duties as listed on the caseworker's job description. Next to the column of each of the job responsibilities is a box which can be checked off as that item is measured by the evaluation instrument. Babbie & Rubin (1989) stated, "One of the most common questionnaire formats is the response series... providing boxes adequately spaced apart is a good option" (1989, p. 164). Each of the Program Coordinators completed this Evaluation Comparison Form for the current Evaluation Instrument and then for the New Evaluation Instrument. According to the number of boxes checked, a determination was made as to what percentage of the items in the job description were evident in each of the evaluation instruments. This percentage score was generated by dividing the number of checked boxes by twenty-seven. It was expected that the correlation of the items on the new evaluation instrument to the job description would be at least 90%. While the correlation of items on the old evaluation instrument to the same job description was expected to be less than 50%. This would indicate that the

new Evaluation Instrument was a more valid and reliable measurement of the caseworkers' actual performance with respect to their job responsibilities.

To strengthen inter-rater reliability, training of the Program Coordinators was completed to familiarize them with the instruments and procedures developed by this writer. The Program Coordinators were instructed to contact this writer directly with any questions or concerns regarding the evaluation instrument. This information was recorded by this writer in a journal and was analyzed in the report-writing phase.

The data was compiled weekly through the forms discussed above. The results of each caseworker evaluation completed during the implementation period was forwarded to the Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper. This person transferred these scores onto the Evaluation Scoring Form, corresponding to the coded identifier for each respective caseworker. The Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper then reported findings via telecommunications and a hard copy directly to this writer. Telephone conferences with each Program Coordinator were completed at the end of the implementation period as feedback.

Ten-week implementation plan.

The implementation period for this project was projected to be ten weeks and to include the development of the new

performance evaluation instrument and scoring forms by this writer, training the Program Coordinators on using this instrument, monitoring the scheduling and completion of each caseworker's evaluation which fell due during the ten weeks, collecting the results of their past evaluation scores (as determined by the old instrument) and present evaluation (using the new instrument) which will be analyzed at the end of the implementation period. The ten-week implementation plan is contained in Appendix A.

CHAPTER FIVE

STRATEGY EMPLOYED

To achieve the practicum goal of increasing the validity and reliability of the caseworker's performance evaluation instrument which measures each caseworker's level of performance in meeting specific job responsibilities, the implementation of the selected solution required the completion of four sections. These sections were the development of the new evaluation instrument, the development of the scoring forms, the training of the Program Coordinators, and the coalition of data. The proposed ten-week implementation plan is contained in Appendix A. This plan was used throughout the ten weeks and was modified as needed. The modifications to this plan and to the solution strategy are discussed below.

The first step was the development of the new evaluation instrument. The agency's current evaluation instrument requires the completion of three sections. In the first section, the caseworker is numerically rated on fifteen "Personality Traits." The second section requires that the Program Coordinator complete a narrative describing the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for the caseworker. In third section, the Program Coordinator and

the caseworker complete the "Employee Career Development Planning Form" and the "Management by Objective Appraisal Form."

To address the goal of the practicum project, this writer developed a new first section of the evaluation instrument. The "Personality Traits" section was replaced with the "Job Responsibilities Section." This new section was developed by incorporating the responsibilities listed on the agency's caseworker job description. It was proposed that there would be twenty-seven separate job responsibilities on which the caseworker's level of performance would be rated. While incorporating the responsibilities into the new evaluation instrument, it was discovered that four of the twenty-seven responsibilities were similar, and these four were condensed into two separate responsibilities. Therefore, the new evaluation instrument rated caseworkers on twenty-five job responsibilities.

As discussed in Chapter Four, the numerical rating was based upon "a behaviorally based (anchored) method that would still permit reliable measurement" (Cascio & Ramos, p. 20). The behaviorally based rating scale used in this new evaluation instrument is consistent with the rating scale on the evaluation instrument for foster parents at this agency and familiar to the Program Coordinators and the caseworkers. This rating scale was utilized to increase the inter-rater

reliability of the caseworkers evaluation scores.

The second section of the solution strategy was the development of the two evaluation scoring forms. The first form was the Evaluation Scoring Form. This form is contained in Appendix B. This form has three columns. The first column lists a code letter for each worker. The second column records the caseworker's evaluation scores received from his or her previous evaluation (using the old evaluation instrument). The third column records each caseworker's evaluation score as determined by his or her current evaluation (using the new evaluation instrument).

At the bottom of columns two and three, the standard deviations of the scores for the old instrument and the new instrument have been computed. These standard deviations were then compared to determine whether the increase in the standard deviation of the new evaluation satisfied the stated objectives of this practicum. This is discussed below in the examination of the results.

The second form developed was the Evaluation Comparison Form. This form was designed in a checklist format that contains the twenty-five caseworker job responsibilities that were contained in the caseworker's job description. It was proposed that each of the involved Program Coordinators and caseworkers would complete this Evaluation Comparison Form for the current Evaluation Instrument and

then for the New Evaluation Instrument. A box was located adjacent to each of the job responsibilities, and this box was checked if that item is measured by the specific evaluation instrument.

After adding the number of boxes checked, a computation was made to determine what percentage of the job description responsibilities correlate to the current evaluation instrument and to the evaluation instrument used in this practicum. These results were later analyzed to determine whether the stated objectives of this practicum were satisfied. This is discussed below in the examination of the results.

The third section of the selected strategy was to provide training to the Program Coordinators to familiarize them with the new instrument and forms developed by this writer. It was originally proposed that this training would be completed in a group setting with all involved Program Coordinators. This strategy had to be modified as this writer was unable to arrange a meeting date and centralized meeting location that was acceptable to each of the involved Program Coordinators. The main obstacles were the traveling time and distance between each program office. This writer modified the training to be conducted individually with each Program Coordinator at his or her respective program office. This modification was required to enable the project to

proceed within the ten-week implementation period.

The fourth section of the selected strategy was the statistical analysis of data. It was proposed that the results of each caseworker's evaluation would be forwarded to the Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper. This person would then transfer these scores onto the Evaluation Scoring Form and then report findings via telecommunications and a hard copy directly to this writer. This proposed strategy had to be modified as the Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper ceased to be employed by the agency during this implementation period. To accommodate for this difficulty, the Program Coordinators were instructed to forward their results directly to this writer who recorded them on the Evaluation Scoring Form.

Another area of difficulty was the timely completion of the evaluations. Before the Personnel and Accounting Recordkeeper had left the agency, he informed this writer that often the caseworker evaluations had not been completed on the scheduled due dates. To resolve this issue, this writer remained in contact with the involved Program Coordinators to ensure that the evaluations were completed and results forward within the appropriate time frames. The Program Coordinators also contacted this writer directly with recommendations and questions regarding the new evaluation instrument. This information was useful in the planning for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

further work on this solution strategy, and this is outlined in Chapter Six.

Results

The agency's policy on Personnel Evaluation (Policy P:6) states that the caseworker's personnel evaluation is to be conducted by his or her Program Coordinator annually at the caseworker's anniversary of employment. The agency's current evaluation instrument was developed over six years ago, and it attempts to measure very few of the caseworker's actual job responsibilities. A new caseworker evaluation instrument was needed to measure the caseworker's level of performance as directly related to the caseworker's actual job responsibilities.

Outcome Measure Number One:

It had been projected that there would be an increase of at least 50 % when comparing the standard deviation of the scores from the previous evaluation to the standard deviation of the scores from the new evaluation.

Results for Outcome Measure Number One:

The results showed that the standard deviation of the scores for the current evaluation instrument was 1.14 and the standard deviation of the scores for the new evaluation was 6.35 (see Table 1). This increase in the standard deviation was greater than the expected increase of 50 %. Thus,

objective number one of this project was met.

Table 1

Performance Evaluation Scoring Form

Caseworker	Current Evaluation Score	Proposed Evaluation Score
A	48	102
B	47	105
C	50	118
D	49	109
E	48	104
Standard Deviation =	1.14 Current Evaluation	6.35 Proposed Evaluation

Outcome Measure Number Two:

It was projected that the correlation of the items on the new evaluation instrument with the items on the job description would be at least 90% and the correlation of the items on the current evaluation instrument with the items on the job description would be less than 50%. This would indicate greater ability of the new evaluation instrument to measure the caseworker's compliance with the job responsibilities as outlined by the job description.

Results for Outcome Number Two:

The involved Program Coordinators completed the

Evaluation Comparison Form (see Appendix D) for the current and new evaluation instruments. By adding the number of items checked and divided by the total number items listed, the percentage of correlation was derived. The results indicated an 88% correlation for the new evaluation and a 28% correlation for the current evaluation. The objective number two was not fully met as the new evaluation failed to achieve the expected 90% level. The current evaluation did achieve the expected less than 50% level.

Chapter Six

Conclusions and Recommendations

Although all the projected outcomes of this project were not fully realized, this writer believes the practicum goal, to increase the validity and reliability of the evaluation instrument, was realized.

In objective number one, it had been projected that there would be an increase of at least 50 % when the standard deviation of the scores from the previous evaluation was compared to the standard deviation of the scores from the new evaluation. The results indicated that this objective was met, because the standard deviation for the previous evaluation of 1.14 was increased to 6.35 for the new evaluation that was developed for this practicum. The increase of the standard deviation from 1.14 to 6.35 on the new evaluation instrument
showed that this new instrument was a more useful tool in differentiating among each caseworkers' levels of performance. The difference between the highest and lowest scores on the previous instrument was only three points. In comparison to the new instrument, the difference between the highest and lowest performers was sixteen points. Thus, the implication was that the new evaluation instrument more accurately differentiated the top performers from the average

and below average performers.

In objective number two, it was projected that the correlation of the items on the new evaluation instrument with the items on the job description would be at least 90% and the correlation of the items on the current evaluation instrument with the items on the job description would be less than 50%. This objective was not met as the results indicated that there was only a 88% correlation of the items on the job description to the new evaluation and not 90%. The results also indicated that there was a 28% correlation of the items on the job description to the current evaluation instrument and was less than 50% as projected.

Although the objective was not fully satisfied, this writer believes that an inference can be made that the practicum goal of increasing the reliability and validity of the evaluation instrument in measuring the caseworker's level of performance at meeting specific job responsibilities was met. The results of this correlation to the current evaluation instrument indicated that less than one third of the caseworker's actual job responsibilities were measured. The results for the new evaluation instrument indicated that this correlation had increased to 88%. This comparison showed the ability of the new evaluation instrument to be a more valid and reliable in measuring a caseworker's level of performance in meeting actual job responsibilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The findings of this practicum project and the solution strategy developed and implemented can be used by this agency as the foundation for continued revision of the evaluation instrument and ultimately lead to the agency's adoption of a new evaluation instrument.

Recommendations

The recommendations listed below are were generated by this writer over the course of the implementation period and recorded in a journal. These recommendations will be presented to the agency's Chief Executive Officer to further assist in the design and adoption of a new evaluation instrument for the agency's caseworkers.

1.) Select a committee consisting of agency administrators, managers and caseworkers to review the findings detailed in this practicum and make any necessary revisions needed that will lead to the adoption of a new caseworker evaluation instrument for this agency.

2.) This committee should also review the current caseworker job description to ensure that it is an accurate and up to date description of the position's responsibilities.

3.) There should be a formal training of all current Program Coordinator and each new Program Coordinator on the proper use of the evaluation instrument. This standard training will increase the reliability and consistency in the evaluation scores.

4.) Review and make revision to the agency's current procedure for ensuring the timely completion of the evaluations. The focus will be to eliminate any evaluations being completed after the due date.

Dissemination

This writer plans to continue the project herein described by presenting this report to this agency's Chief Executive Office to be considered as a model for adoption of a new agency evaluation instrument. This writer will volunteer to participate on the agency's committee for the adoption of a new agency evaluation instrument and to present the results of this practicum to this committee. This writer will volunteer to assist in the formal training of the Program Coordinators on the use of the instrument.

REFERENCES

Alexander Hamilton Institute. (1989). Performance appraisals: The latest nightmare. Maywood, N.J.: Modern Business Reports.

Babbie, E., & Rubin, A. (1989). Research methods for social work. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth.

Brillinger, B.A., (1990). Supervision in human services: A staff support system. Downsview, Ontario: The Dellcrest Resource Centre.

Burda, D. (1992, February). Hospital employs TQM principals to rework its evaluation system. Modern Healthcare, p. 60.

Carson, K.P., Cardy, R.L., & Dobbins, G.H. (1992, November). Upgrading the employee evaluation process. Human Resource Magazine, 37 (11), 88-92.

Cascio, W.J. & Ramos, R.A. (1986). Assessing job performance in behavioral/economic terms. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 20-28.

Cathcart, D.A., Hemminger, P.L., Hoffman, K.D. & Van Veen, P.H. (1983). The developing law of wrongful terminations. Los Angeles: Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher.

Child Welfare League of America, Inc. (1991). Staffing the child welfare agency: recruitment and retention. Washington, D.C: Author.

Emerson, S.M. (1991, January/February). Job evaluation: A barrier to excellence ? Compensation and Benefits Review, 39-51.

Froiland, P. (1993, October). Who's getting trained ? Training, 53-64.

Hahn, D.C. & Diphoye, R.L. (1988). Effects of training and information on the accuracy and reliability of job evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, (73), 146-153.

Mohrman, A.M., West, S.M., & Lawler, E.E. (1989). Designing performance appraisal systems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shoenfelt, E., Eastman, N., Mendel, R. (1991). The relative effectiveness of training methods for attaining training objectives: Current opinion of training practitioners. Department of Psychology at Western Kentucky University.

Szilagyi, A.D., Jr. (1984). Management and performance (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Company.

Whitmore, Jean., (1191). Mobilizing training resources for rural foster parents, adoptive parents and applicants in Oregon, U.S.A. Child Welfare. (70), 211-218.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED TEN-WEEK IMPEMENTATION PLAN

TEN-WEEK IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Week One:

1. Design the new performance evaluation instrument incorporating the caseworker's job responsibilities.
2. Meet with Personnel Director to determine the number of caseworkers' evaluations will be completed during the implementation period.
3. Schedule to meet in week three with the Program Coordinators, who will be conducting evaluations of caseworkers during the implementation period, to provide training on the new evaluation format and to answer questions.
4. Arrange meeting with Chief Executive Officer to be held in week two to seek approve for use of the instrument.
5. Begin using a journal each week to record activities, progress, problems, unexpected results or events and actions taken to remediate any unexpected events.
6. Design and complete the Evaluation Comparison Form.

Week Two:

1. Complete the new performance evaluation instrument incorporating the caseworker's job responsibilities.
2. Design and complete the Evaluation Scoring Form.
3. Present the new evaluation instrument to the agency's Chief Executive Officer to obtain her approval for its use.
4. Update journal for this week to record all activities and events related to the project,

5. Survey the Program Coordinators and Caseworkers who are involved in completing evaluations during this implementation period to determine what percentage of the caseworker's job description correlates to the current evaluation instrument using the Evaluation Comparison Form.

Week Three:

1. Make any revisions on the new evaluation instrument as suggested by the agency's Chief Executive Officer.
2. Meet with all the Program Coordinators to present this new evaluation instrument, discuss the format and point scoring system, present a copy of this evaluation instrument to the caseworkers before the evaluation is conducted, and instruct them to notify this writer with any problems or questions regarding the use of this instrument.
3. Begin using this performance evaluation instrument on all caseworker evaluations through the tenth week.
4. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.
5. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.
6. Update journal for this week to record all activities and events related to the project,

Week Four:

1. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.
2. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.

3. Update journal for this week to record all activities and events related to the project,

Week Five:

1. Collect the previous evaluation scores, using the old instrument, for each of the caseworkers involved in this practicum project.

2. Record each caseworker's previous evaluation scores on the Evaluation Comparison Form.

3. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.

4. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.

5. Update journal for this week to record all activities and events related to the project,

Week Six:

1. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.

2. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.

3. Update journal for this week to record all activities and events related to the project,

Week Seven:

1. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.

2. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.

3. Update journal for this week to record all activities and

events related to the project,

Week Eight:

1. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.
2. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.
3. Update journal for this week to record all activities and events related to the project,

Week Nine:

1. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.
2. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.
3. Update journal for this week to record all activities and events related to the project,

Week Ten:

1. Monitor this week's scheduled caseworker evaluations and confirm completion and use of the new instrument.
2. Obtain caseworkers' evaluation scores for this week as recorded on the Evaluation Scoring Form.
3. Review all caseworkers' Evaluation Scoring Forms and record each of these scores in Column B of the Evaluation Comparison Form.
4. Complete journal by recording all activities and events related to the project for this week and related observations.

5. Contact all Program Coordinators and caseworkers who were involved in this project to (1) obtain their feedback and suggestions for improvement and (2) thank them for their participation.

APPENDIX B

CASEWORKER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
Caseworker/Social Worker

DATE _____

NAME _____

JOB TITLE _____

JOB LOCATION _____

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL _____

DATE OF LAST EVALUATION _____

ADMINISTRATOR _____

Please complete this form carefully and thoroughly. Remember its purpose is to:

- Provide objective criteria for personnel performance evaluations on a standard basis within Children's Choice;
- Compel you to examine all of the individual traits affecting employee performance;
- Help you to support your conclusion and recommendation for job classification and compensation improvements.

INSTRUCTIONS

1) Complete and numerically score the Job Responsibilities Section.

2) Complete page 7 on strengths, weaknesses and recommendation.

3) Complete Employee Career Development Planning Form, Management by Objective Appraisal Form and Critical Incident Report Form.

4) Forward to Chief Executive Officer with salary recommendation.

Finally, you should describe the employee's reaction to this evaluation, make your recommendation for any changes in the employee's job classification or rate of pay and complete a salary modification form.

JOB RESPONSIBILITIES SECTION

1.) To asses and know each client to sufficient depth as to be able to counsel him/her effectively and appropriately according to his/her needs and agreed upon individual service plan goals;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

2.) To serve as a role model for clients in terms of the professional worker, his relationship to society, his clients and himself;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

3.) To subscribe to Children's Choice's suggestion for demeanor and proper working attire;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

4.) To report for work promptly according to the schedule determined by the Chief Executive Officer and accept after hours work when needed;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5.) To perform all duties without preferential treatment to any client, but demonstrating individual respect for each person;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

6.) To be knowledgeable of and to uphold the administration policies, proceedures and principals of Children's Choice;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

7.) To respect to the highest degree the confidentiality of each client and their family;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

8.) To cooperate to the fullest extent with all Federal and State authorities as directed by Children's Choice administration.

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

9.) To maintain an average caseload of not more than fifteen clients or ten host families as assigned by the Chief Executive Officer ; to meet with each resident so assigned for at least one hour each week or as outlined by each client's level of care;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

10.) To work with the clients individually and collectively to implement the development of an individual case plan for each client to assist each client to implement that plan during the clients planned stay in the Children's Choice program;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

11.) To counsel clients, facilitating their transition from previous placements to their current placement, focusing upon established goal of family reunification or, if this is impossible, independent living at program completion. Counseling includes, but is not limited to: Formulation of objectives directly related to the client's goals and the actions necessary to meet those objections; client's understanding of his responsibilities in meeting program requirements assessment of clients' needs; analysis of and dealing with client fears; assistance in job search; and resolution of family and legal problems;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

12.) To maintain accurate, detailed and current case records on each resident; to complete contact log entries and case session reports for each client according to the instruction of the Chief Executive Officer or whenever appropriate; (Each entry shall also include date, time, and the signature of the worker);

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

13.) To prepare a quarterly progress report on each client on his assigned caseload according to established deadlines;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

14.) To report to emergency after hours duty worker and receive from worker being relieved all information relevant to the present status of each and every client;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

15.) To aid in periodic staff review of each client's progress for classification, privileges and case progression;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

16.) To relay summary information on each resident to Program Coordinator or his appointed designee at regularly scheduled supervisory meetings;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

17.) To attend all scheduled staff meetings, supervisory conferences and in-service training sessions;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

18.) To undertake any appropriate assignments requested by the Program Coordinator, Regional Director and/or Chief Executive Officer ;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

19.) To assist the Program Coordinator in analyzing each client's needs and in the development of appropriate programs for the client;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

20.) To act on behalf of the Program Coordinator in that individual's absence as requested to do so;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

21.) To assist in the training of para-professional staff as requested;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

22.) To plan and conduct group meetings as scheduled or assigned by the Program Coordinator;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

23.) To note any behavior requiring disciplinary action and to report such via written documentation as appropriate;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

24.) To greet, conduct general discussions with prospective foster parents, clients or prospective client's family members as requested by the Program Coordinator;

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

25.) To obtain at least forty hours of formal staff training per year, approved by the Chief Executive Officer.

(5) Consistently meets and exceeds standards
(4) Frequently meets and exceeds standards
(3) Meets and maintains standards
(2) Meets and occasionally falls below standards
(1) Consistently falls below standards

SCORE_____

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING IN NARRATIVE FORM

Comment on principal strengths:

Comment on principal weaknesses and suggestions for improvements:

Has this evaluation been discussed with the employee? ___Yes ___No

Comments:

Your recommendation for present and future job classification:

EMPLOYEE CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FORM

1. To what position within the agency could the employee logically be promoted now or in the immediate future?

Now _____ Future (1 yr.)

2. Does the employee have the information, skills and attitudes needed to be successful in that position? ____ Yes ____ No

If "No", then indicate the learning objectives that must be achieved prior to promotion or through in-service training once the employee has been promoted.

Learning objectives for prior training	Learning objectives for in-service training

3. In what ways can the agency help the employee to achieve the learning objectives?

4. Is the employee interested in continued employment with the agency?

____ Yes ____No

If "No" and the performance appraisal results are generally successful, then indicate the steps that the agency can take to interest the employee in continued employment?

5. If continued employment is desired, then indicate the highest position to which the employee currently aspires.

6. To what, if any, position outside the agency does the employee aspire?

7. What can the agency do to help the staff member to prepare for career advancement within the agency or with another employer?

8. Can you identify a current employee to take the place of this employee should promotion occur? ____ Yes ____ No

If "No", indicate steps to be taken to develop a replacement.

MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVE APPRAISAL FORM

A	B	C
ANNUAL OBJECTIVES AGREED TO (+/-)	ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE	FACTORS AFFECTING ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Employee Evaluation of Experience with Children's Choice thus far:

Comments by Evaluator:

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION SCORING FORM

Performance Evaluation Scoring Form

Caseworker	Current Evaluation Score	Proposed Evaluation Score
A		
B		
C		
D		
E		

Standard Deviation = $\frac{\text{Current Evaluation}}{\text{Proposed Evaluation}}$

The percentage increase in comparing the Standard Deviation of the Current Evaluation to the Standard Deviation of the Proposed Evaluation: =_____% increase in the S.D. of the scores

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION COMPARISON FORM

CASEWORKER'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SURVEY
RE: Proposed Instrument Only

Instructions:
Listed below are the duties/responsibilities for the caseworker position. Place a check in the box adjacent to each duty/responsibility only if you feel the **proposed** performance evaluation instrument accurately measures that specific duty/responsibility.

( ) To asses and know each client to sufficient depth as to be able to counsel him/her effectively and appropriately according to his/her needs and agreed upon goals;

( ) To serve as a role model for clients in terms of the professional worker, his rela-tionship to society, his clients and himself;

( ) To subscribe to Children's Choice's suggestion for demeanor and proper working attire;

( ) To report for work promptly according to the schedule determined by the Chief Executive Officer or/and his designee herein listed;

( ) To perform all duties without preferential treatment to any client, but demon-strating individual respect for each person;

( ) To be knowledgeable of and to uphold the administration policies and principals of Children's Choice;

( ) To respect to the highest degree the confidentiality of each resident;

( ) To cooperate to the fullest extent with all Federal and State authorities as directed by Children's Choice administration.

( ) To maintain a caseload of not more than fifteen clients or ten host families as assigned by the Program Coordinator; to meet with each resident so assigned for at least one hour each week;

( ) To work with the clients individually and collectively to implement the development of an individual case plan for each client to assist each client to implement that plan during the clients planned stay in the Children's Choice program;

( ) To counsel clients, facilitating their transition from previous placements to their current placement, focusing upon established goal of family reunification or, if this is impossible, independent living at program completion. Counseling includes, but is not limited to: Formulation of objectives directly related to the client's goals and the actions necessary to meet those objections; client's understanding of his responsibilities in meeting program

requirements assessment of clients' needs; analysis of and dealing with client fears; assistance in job search; and resolution of family and legal problems;

( ) To maintain accurate, detailed and current case records on each resident; to make contact log entries according to the instruction of the Program Coordinator or whenever appropriate; (Each entry shall include date, time, and initials of the recorder);

( ) To prepare a monthly progress report on each client on his assigned caseload according to established deadlines;

( ) To report to emergency after hours duty worker and receive from worker being relieved all information relevant to the present status of each and every client;

( ) To aid in periodic staff review of each client's progress for classification, privileges and case progression;

( ) To relay summary information on each resident to Program Coordinator or his appointed designee at regularly scheduled supervisory meetings;

( ) To attend all scheduled staff meetings, supervisory conferences and in-service training sessions;

( ) To undertake any appropriate assignments requested by the Program Director;

( ) To assist the Program Coordinator in analyzing client needs and development of appropriate programs;

( ) To act on behalf of the Program Coordinator in that individual's absence or when requested to do so;

( ) To assist in the training of para-professional staff as requested;

( ) To plan and conduct group meetings as scheduled or assigned by the Program Coordinator;

( ) To note behavior needing disciplinary action and to recommend such via written documentation as appropriate;

( ) To greet, conduct general discussions with prospective foster parents, clients or prospective client's family members as requested by the Program Coordinator;

( ) To obtain at least forty hours of formal staff training per year, approved by the Program Coordinator.

Thank you for your time and consideration in completing this survey. Your input is of great value to this project and to our agency.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CASEWORKER'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SURVEY
RE: Current Instrument Only

Instructions:
Listed below are the duties/responsibilities for the caseworker position. Place a check in the box adjacent to each duty/responsibility only if you feel the **current** performance evaluation instrument accurately measures that specific duty/responsibility.

( ) To asses and know each client to sufficient depth as to be able to counsel him/her effectively and appropriately according to his/her needs and agreed upon goals;

( ) To serve as a role model for clients in terms of the professional worker, his rela-tionship to society, his clients and himself;

( ) To subscribe to Children's Choice's suggestion for demeanor and proper working attire;

( ) To report for work promptly according to the schedule determined by the Chief Executive Officer or/and his designee herein listed;

( ) To perform all duties without preferential treatment to any client, but demon-strating individual respect for each person;

( ) To be knowledgeable of and to uphold the administration policies and principals of Children's Choice;

( ) To respect to the highest degree the confidentiality of each resident;

( ) To cooperate to the fullest extent with all Federal and State authorities as directed by Children's Choice administration.

( ) To maintain a caseload of not more than fifteen clients or ten host families as assigned by the Program Coordinator; to meet with each resident so assigned for at least one hour each week;

( ) To work with the clients individually and collectively to implement the development of an individual case plan for each client to assist each client to implement that plan during the clients planned stay in the Children's Choice program;

( ) To counsel clients, facilitating their transition from previous placements to their current placement, focusing upon established goal of family reunification or, if this is impossible, independent living at program completion. Counseling includes, but is not limited to: Formulation of objectives directly related to the client's goals and the actions necessary to meet those objections; client's understanding of his responsibilities in meeting program requirements assessment of clients' needs; analysis of and

dealing with client fears; assistance in job search; and resolution of family and legal problems;

( ) To maintain accurate, detailed and current case records on each resident; to make contact log entries according to the instruction of the Program Coordinator or whenever appropriate; (Each entry shall include date, time, and initials of the recorder);

( ) To prepare a monthly progress report on each client on his assigned caseload according to established deadlines;

( ) To report to emergency after hours duty worker and receive from worker being relieved all information relevant to the present status of each and every client;

( ) To aid in periodic staff review of each client's progress for classification, privileges and case progression;

( ) To relay summary information on each resident to Program Coordinator or his appointed designee at regularly scheduled supervisory meetings;

( ) To attend all scheduled staff meetings, supervisory conferences and in-service training sessions;

( ) To undertake any appropriate assignments requested by the Program Director;

( ) To assist the Program Coordinator in analyzing client needs and development of appropriate programs;

( ) To act on behalf of the Program Coordinator in that individual's absence or when requested to do so;

( ) To assist in the training of para-professional staff as requested;

( ) To plan and conduct group meetings as scheduled or assigned by the Program Coordinator;

( ) To note behavior needing disciplinary action and to recommend such via written documentation as appropriate;

( ) To greet, conduct general discussions with prospective foster parents, clients or prospective client's family members as requested by the Program Coordinator;

( ) To obtain at least forty hours of formal staff training per year, approved by the Program Coordinator.

Thank you for your time and consideration in completing this survey. Your input is of great value to this project and to our agency.